

other surviving Americans and Allied personnel who fought in the Great War on French soil.

□ 2000

Madam Speaker, I cannot be more proud to represent such a fine soldier of freedom.

Madam Speaker, Captain Gladly served with French soldiers for 1 year before receiving an honorable discharge. His efforts in the name of freedom are unforgettable and worthy of the recognition and tribute he has received.

Captain Gladly's service to his country can only be matched by his service to his church, his community and his family. As one of the first honorably discharged veterans to join the American Legion, Captain Gladly has dedicated 80 years to caring for other veterans and their widows.

After his discharge, Captain Gladly spent 30 years working at sea in the North Carolina fishing industry. He spent 20 years as a menhaden fishing boat captain where he received his nickname, "Captain Gladly." He was married to his late wife, Ruth, for 72 years, and has a daughter, Sarita Shaw, and two granddaughters, Catherine Watkins and Elizabeth Duff.

Madam Speaker, William Gladstone Oglesby is a good man, a good American, and truly one of our Nation's soldiers of freedom. He answered his country's call to duty. His dedication to protect our country and preserve the principles that America was founded upon has helped to ensure and provide for the survival of this Nation.

As President Wilson said: "To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have . . . with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured."

Madam Speaker, my grandfather was gassed during World War I at the Battle of the Argonne forest. Thankfully he was fortunate to survive, but not everyone was as lucky. Many lost fathers, brothers, husbands and sons. Their courage and the courage of all who serve this Nation, have provided for the free and democratic Nation that we enjoy today.

Captain Gladly and all who serve this country represent the America that rose to greatness on the shoulders of ordinary citizens. They are the men and women who accept the highest responsibility and make the ultimate sacrifice to preserve peace and freedom for all of its citizens.

Captain Gladly, with your 103rd birthday approaching on April 4, I would like to extend to you a happy birthday, and best wishes to you, and I thank you and your country thanks you for

your heroic courage in the name of freedom.

#### H.J. RES. 22—MAKING THE BIRTHDAY OF CESAR ESTRADA CHAVEZ A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor an inspiring and beloved man, Cesar Estrada Chavez. Today we honor him in anticipation of his birthday next week, and I ask the Members of the House of Representatives to join us in paying respect to a man who brought dignity to men, women and children who have continued to struggle in the fields.

In January Cesar Chavez was bestowed one of the greatest honors when he was inducted into the U.S. Department of Labor's Hall of Fame. This honor is solely reserved for Americans whose contributions to the field of labor have enhanced the quality of lives of millions.

Not only did he enhance the lives of millions, but he touched us deeply with his compassion and commitment to La Causa. La Causa, the cause of the poor; La Causa, the cause of nonviolence; La Causa, representing those who do not have representation.

As my colleagues may know, Cesar Chavez rose from a fruit and vegetable picker to be the head of the United Farm Workers of America. From the beginning, Cesar Chavez instilled in the UFW the principles of nonviolence as practiced by Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. When the United Farm Workers began the strike in the 1960's to protest the treatment of farm workers, the strikers took a pledge of nonviolence. Many of my colleagues may remember the 25-day fast conducted by Cesar Chavez which reaffirmed the United Farm Workers' commitment to nonviolence.

For those of us who lived through those years, those troubling years, in that time period, we heard of the great odds Chavez faced, and we recognized, a lot of us were involved directly in his efforts, as he led a successful 5-year strike boycott. Through this boycott Chavez was able to forge a national support coalition of unions, church groups, students, minorities and consumers. By the end of the boycott, everyone knew the chant that unified the group: "Sí se puede," yes, we can, and it was a chant of encouragement, pride and dignity.

Although we knew him for his advocacy on behalf of farm workers, he was influential in various other areas. He helped communities to mobilize by assisting them with voter registration drives and insisting that minority communities had a right to an education, had a right to have access to a quality education.

Many of us today look to Cesar Chavez for inspiration, even here in the Halls of Congress. Those of us who continue this fight do so in order to give voices to the voiceless and dignity that is deserved by all laborers who, no matter what their work, will recognize their work and recognize them with dignity.

Throughout the country, like in San Antonio, there will be celebrations. I know in San Antonio Jamie Martinez, a labor leader, will be conducting a parade and a march in his honor, not only in his honor but on his causes and the importance of his cause.

Americans have seen few leaders such as Cesar Chavez. To honor his work and deeds I ask that you join myself and 56 other colleagues in supporting H.J. Res. 22 to make his birthday a national holiday. To all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I tell them tonight: "Sí se puede." Together, yes, we can.

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. THUNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allocated to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), that I be allowed to use that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

#### DO NOT BUY THE LIE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Madam Speaker, for the past three months I have listened as our friends on the other side have extolled the virtues of the President's budget. Today we had an opportunity to vote on a series of alternative budgets, one of which was the President's budget, and I just have one question:

Where did all the President's men and all the President's women go when it came time to vote on that budget? The President's budget, today when it was voted on in the House, got two, two votes out of 435, and when it was voted on in the Senate the other day, it got two votes in the Senate.

Now we have to ask ourselves, why is that? Why did the President's budget only get two votes in the House and two votes in the Senate? I think that once the smoke had cleared and the dust had settled, it became clear that the charade was over.

Maybe it is because the President spends the Social Security surplus in his budget, maybe it is because the President's budget raises taxes by \$172 billion. Maybe it is because in the President's budget there was no funding for priorities that he mentioned in his State of the Union address, priorities that rolled out like they were

never going to end, like agriculture, and he did not put any money in his budget for important priorities like reforming the crop insurance program.

Maybe there were only two votes in the House today on the President's budget because the President cuts Medicare. In spite of all the rhetoric about saving Medicare and putting aside 15 percent, the President's budget cut Medicare by about \$10 million.

Maybe it was because the President's budget busted the budget caps. I mean it could be any of those reasons, but the fact of the matter is that when all the posturing was done in this Chamber and all the lofty rhetoric was put aside, it came time to vote, nobody was there to vote in favor of the President's budget.

So we rolled out an alternative, the Republican budget plan, today, and already for weeks our friends on the other side, the Democrats, have been assailing that budget. But then, as my colleagues know, the rhetoric started to tone down a little bit because they looked at it, and they said: "Well, you know we want to attack the Republican budget for Social Security," and then they realized that we were locking up, walling off the Social Security Trust Fund, making sure that all the payroll tax was actually going into the trust fund where it should. And then they thought, well maybe we can attack the Republicans again on Medicare because they did not fall for the President's percentages game and say, well, we are going to do 15 percent here and 62 percent here, and 20 percent here, 10 percent here. But then they realized that by locking up the payroll tax the Republican budget puts aside more money for Social Security and Medicare than the President's budget.

So, that issue is off the table, and the fact of the matter is they could not attack, they want to attack for the veterans budget, but the Republican budget actually funded veterans at \$1 billion more than the President's budget. It funded agriculture at \$6 billion more than the President's budget.

So then it was the old traditional line about it is tax cuts for the rich. Well, as my colleagues know, if we look at the budget, there are not any tax cuts specified in there. Yes, we believe that we ought to have a debate. Once we have walled off Social Security and taken care of that program and Medicare, and there is \$800 billion projected over the next 10 years that comes in over and above that, then we believe we ought to engage in debate in this city about whether or not to give that back to the American people or whether to spend it here in Washington. But we will have that debate when and if the time comes. But in the meantime we need to do the responsible thing and the honest thing, and that is to wall off Social Security and make sure that it is there for the next generation of Americans.

In fact, I want to read something here that AARP, Mr. Horace Deets, the Executive Director of AARP, said about the Republican budget plan. It says: "AARP believes it is important to protect Social Security's growing reserves and is pleased that the House budget resolution provides that protection. Over the next 10 years, Social Security is projected to contribute \$1.8 trillion of the unified surplus. Preserving Social Security's reserves not only allows our country to better prepare for the impending retirement of the baby boom generation, but also gives us greater financial flexibility to enact long-term reform in both Social Security and Medicare once the options have been carefully considered and their impact understood."

That is from the AARP, and what I would simply say to the American people here this evening is:

"When you listen to all this rhetoric over the course of the next few months, who are you going to trust to solve these problems, Social Security and Medicare? Are you going to trust the people who are going to be honest with you and say that we are going to put the payroll tax, Social Security and Medicare, aside where it should be walled off to be used for those purposes, or are you going to trust the people who want to keep raiding it like we have in the past?"

I think the American people are wise, I think the Americans in this country who are currently benefiting from Social Security and Medicare have figured this out, and I have one simple message for them this evening, and that is:

Do not buy the lie. We have heard it before, we are going to hear it again. Work with us in a constructive way to build a better future for the 21st century.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to the opportunity, when we get past all the posturing and all the rhetoric, to work with my colleagues on the other side to come up with a budget that takes care of these important priorities.

#### TRANSPORTATION EMPLOYEE FAIR TAXATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce important legislation to provide tax fairness for thousands of hard-working Americans throughout this Nation who are employed by interstate water carriers. I am talking about river boat pilots, I am talking about men and women who work on barges, and I am talking about other hard-working crew members who do an honest day's work and want a fair shake when it comes to paying their taxes.

Madam Speaker, I am deeply concerned that a significant number of interstate waterway employees who are employed on vessels that operate on the Columbia River, the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Kanawha, and many other inland waterways throughout this Nation may be double or even triple-taxed for their labor. These river pilots, officers and other crew members perform most of their work on rivers which flow through multiple States, and in many cases these folks are subject to income tax filings and additional withholdings from multiple States.

The rivers these folks navigate, whether it be for shipping, for transporting passengers, for tourism or other purposes often course through the territories of multiple States. That is a fact of nature, and because of that fact the folks who ply their trade on these rivers are subject to taxation by several States. That is simply not fair.

When truck drivers, railway workers and aviation employees go about their jobs, all of whom are required to conduct their work in States other than their home State, Congress has seen fit to grant them an exemption from this double or triple taxation unless a majority of the work is performed in another State.

□ 2015

This is not so for interstate waterway employees. No. If one is a crew member on a barge, they can be required to pay taxes in several States, and that is simply not fair.

An airline pilot, for example, is subject to taxation by the State in which the pilot resides, period. Only if pilots earn 50 percent or more of their income while working in another State are they subject to taxation by that other State. This restriction, for all practical purposes, exempts airline employees from multiple taxation. However, interstate water carriers, bargemen, river boat pilots, ferry boat operators, for some reason these people are treated differently, and that is simply not fair.

Frankly, Madam Speaker, it is a clear example of taxation without representation, an obvious oversight of this body.

Over the past 22 years, Congress has acted to address inequities in the Tax Code when it dealt with interstate transportation employees. I am asking my colleagues today to again take action to address and correct this problem.

Interstate waterway employees are devoted, hard working folks, who provide essential transportation services throughout our Nation and pay their fair share of taxes in their home States. Additionally, the companies which employ these workers contribute significantly to the economic well-being of the State's concerns. Yet,